UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2589th MEETING: 13 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2589)	1
Expression of welcome to the new representative of the United States	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2589th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 13 June 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2589)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Expression of welcome to the new representative of the United States

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to extend a warm welcome on behalf of the Council to the new representative of the United States, Mr. Vernon A. Walters. I should like to assure him that members of the Council look forward to working in close co-operation with him.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sinclair, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

5. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2587th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Mboumoua (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic

Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Murargy (Mozambique), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Mrs. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Odaka (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Argentina, Bolivia, the Congo and Hungary in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mrs. Carrasco (Bolivia), Mr. Gayama (Congo) and Mr. Racz (Hungary) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

7. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 13 June from the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which reads as follows:

> "On behalf of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, I have the honour to request to be invited to participate in the Council's consideration of the situation in Namibia, under the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure."

In accordance with past practice, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee.

It was so decided.

8. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received from the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt and Madagascar a letter dated 12 June [*S/17265*] which reads as follows:

> "We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the situation in Namibia the Security Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Gora Ebrahim, representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council accedes to that request.

It was so decided.

9. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

10. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam): Allow me at the outset, on behalf of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, to extend a warm welcome and congratulations to the high-ranking representatives of so many members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries present here at these solemn meetings of the Council. The presence of such an impressive number of ministers for foreign affairs and statesmen at this debate demonstrates the great importance the Non-Aligned Movement and justice-upholding peoples throughout the world attach to the cause of Namibian independence.

11. Viet Nam has on many occasions, in this forum and in other international forums, made clear its position on the question of Namibia. We have listened carefully to the speeches delivered during the past three days and are happy to find absolute agreement among the speakers on this question. That agreement is not restricted to the confines of this chamber; it reflects the agreement of the entire world. Namibia has become a great issue of conscience for all progressive humanity because it has been languishing for more than a century under the colonial yoke. Even after the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the defence of the Namibian people's destiny 19 years ago [*General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966*], that people continued to be mercilessly persecuted and massacred and their land is being turned into a new-type colony and a military base of the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria.

12. Many people believe that we were closer to Namibian independence in 1978 than we are in the 1980s. That is obviously true. Pretoria blatantly flouts all United Nations resolutions on Namibia by continuing its illegal occupation of the Territory and by using it as a springboard to attack the neighbouring countries, thus threatening the peace and security of the region and of the world as well. After the shameful failure of the so-called Turnhalle government, the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria is now going to install another puppet "interim government" in Namibia. This act has been denounced and condemned throughout the world.

13. The deadlock is further aggravated by the insistence of Pretoria and Washington on extraneous issues, such as the presence of the Cuban volunteers in Angola. This has definitely nothing to do with the granting of independence to Namibia, for the presence of Cuban volunteers in Angola is

a matter agreed upon between two sovereign States. Those who cling to this pretext are doubtless practising the dirty trick of holding Namibia's independence to political ransom, thereby exposing themselves as the opponents of the cause of the Namibian people.

14. It is believed that the United States must bear responsibility for the intransigence of the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria. Billions of United States dollars in aid to Pretoria, the so-called constructive engagement policy pursued by the present United States Administration, which was relevantly paraphrased by Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as "destructive engagement", have emboldened that ruthless régime in its war of extermination against Namibia and its undeclared wars against the front-line States. It is worth noting that while the United States acted so quickly and mercilessly in declaring sanctions against the Sandinist Government of Nicaragua, it publicly protected the reactionary régime of South Africa by the brazen use of its veto against any resolution calling for economic sanctions against Pretoria.

15. At this forum, many representatives have agreed that now is the time for the independence of Namibia. What should we do then? This question has been raised for the last two decades. In 1983 Mr. Sam Nujoma declared before this body that the question of Namibia demanded positive and immediate action, not simple exhortations or hollow promises [*2439th meeting, para. 111*]. This holds true today. The developments in Namibia constitute a flagrant challenge to the conscience and pride of mankind—a tumour so painful that it demands urgently to be operated on. It is, therefore, our duty as the people of the world to help these martyred people free themselves from the yoke of tyranny and also, in the process, to help remove the blot on our conscience.

16. The United Nations Council for Namibia has so far done good work for the cause of the Namibian people; last year it organized meaningful seminars on the occasion of Namibia's hundredth year under foreign occupation. In our opinion, the United Nations Council for Namibia truly lives up to its role as the sole legal authority of the Territory. Now that Pretoria is attempting to bypass the United Nations on this question, our Organization, in particular the Security Council, should exhaust all available measures to stop the *apartheid* régime from attaining its goal. The question of Namibia is not only a question of decolonization; it also relates to the maintenance of peace and security. We urge the Council to adopt effective measures, including mandatory sanctions, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to ensure the unconditional, immediate and complete implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the sole legal basis for the solution of the Namibian question. Any solution outside the framework of that resolution must be considered null and void. We fully support the Secretary-General in his endeavours to initiate dialogue conducive to the attainment of independence for Namibia and call upon other members to do the same. We urge the Council to work out a specific and concrete calendar for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and to exert maximum political pressure upon South Africa and its protectors.

17. The solidarity of the international community with the peoples struggling for national liberation plays a very important role. In their struggle against United States aggression and occupation and for national salvation, the Vietnamese people enjoyed the sympathy and support of the American people and we are truly grateful in this respect. We think, therefore, that the solidarity of the South African and American peoples is at present particularly vital to the struggle for independence of the Namibian people. We are glad to note that the American people is now taking into serious consideration the situation in Namibia and putting more pressure on the United States Administration to put an end to its aid to the *apartheid* régime. The recent adoption by an overwhelming majority of the United States Congress of a resolution on economic sanctions against South Africa eloquently reflects the will of the majority of the American people. The international community, on the other hand, should be mobilized to render maximum support and assistance to the peoples of Namibia and the front-line States. The attainment of independence for Namibia is the cause of all people of conscience the world over.

18. The people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, for their part, reaffirm their unreserved support for the people of Namibia in their struggle, including armed struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative. At the same time, we welcome the goodwill on the part of SWAPO in seeking a peaceful settlement of the question. We are confident that sooner or later the people of that land will be freed and will join the international community as an independent State.

19. This important series of meetings, requested by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April, will mark a turning point in the search for the independence of Namibia. We are glad to be participating and would like to thank you and the other members of the Council for giving us the opportunity to do so. We are convinced that, with your diplomatic skills and wisdom, you will lead the work of the Council for this month to fruitful results.

20. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Seychelles. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

21. Mrs. GONTHIER (Seychelles): My delegation is very pleased to see a fellow islander presiding. We are also especially gratified, Sir, to see you display the special brand of island feelings towards our brothers and sisters in Namibia.

22. I should like also to pay tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and to the representative of Thailand for having seen the Council through the trials and tribulations of the month of May with grace and dignity.

23. Since this is the first time I have spoken before the Council this year, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate all the new members and to welcome the representative of the United States.

24. I shall be brief. We all know what resolution 435 (1978) represents. We all know that the people of Namibia still wait for resolution 435 (1978) to be implemented. The majority of us also think that making Namibia's liberation contingent upon Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola is a perfidious act.

25. However, in this charged atmosphere, the country itself gets forgotten, the real Namibia that lies under all the layers of argument and obfuscation. While debates continue here, there and everywhere, that suffering country waits to be restored, not only so that onlookers can see it more clearly, but so that it may rediscover itself. I repeat: rediscover itself. If that is to happen—and it is the sincere hope of the Republic of Seychelles that it will happen soon—our actions here, there and everywhere must speak louder than our words.

26. When Governments sit and make policy regarding Namibia, they should be reminded that policy affects people. They should feel for the human suffering going on in Namibia, understand clearly why and how the struggle is taking place, and think of their own histories and how their own Governments came into being. And yes, they should have pity for all the bleeding and the tears, and resolve that the Namibian people deserve to laugh and to smile so that they may know the joy of our own lucky lives.

27. Mr. de KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is a privilege for the Council during this difficult month of June to see your country, Sir, occupying the presidency. We are grateful to you for having been good enough personally to place your experience and authority at the service of the Council for this debate. I take advantage of your presence here to recall the excellent relations between Trinidad and Tobago and my country. On a personal note, I would add that, as you know, I have often had occasion to visit your country and your Government. I am personally acquainted with your President, and wish particularly to convey my greetings to him as he is a former representative to the United Nations. I recall here too that Trinidadian society is an example of a successful multiracial society.

28. I ask you to convey to your predecessors, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, my delegation's gratitude for the outstanding way in which they conducted the proceedings of the Council in May.

29. A number of Ministers for Foreign Affairs are present for these meetings, and their presence underscores the importance of our work and the weight of the responsibilities we bear.

30. Finally, it is my pleasure to welcome our new colleague in the Council, Mr. Vernon Walters. I know already, for it is clear from his past record, that thanks to his human qualities and his exceptional knowledge of foreign languages—including French—he will be a partner who will be listened to, not only because he represents the great democracy of the United States, but because of his own background: His experience of world affairs, both military and diplomatic, will be valuable to us in our debates. His knowledge of my country, where he lived for a long time, is exceptionally thorough, and we recall that among his heroes is General de Gaulle. He says he is neither shy nor modest, but rather pragmatic. He is, therefore, open to all ideas and is without prejudices. We are very happy to welcome him.

31. France fully shares the concern of the non-aligned countries, which, at their meeting held at New Delhi last April, decided to ask the Security Council once again to consider the question of Namibia. That concern, that frustration are particularly great for the African countries, which are impatient to see Namibia achieve independence at last.

32. It is known that France has taken an active part in the efforts of the international community to make South Africa live up to its obligations. I have no wish to go over the past, since everyone here will remember it, but shall try to refer only to the present situation.

33. The United Nations, particularly the Security Council, bears primary responsibility towards Namibia and its people. There is a United Nations plan, which constitutes the only acceptable basis for a final settlement of the question of Namibia. It is contained in Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Those resolutions form a coherent whole and could rapidly be fully implemented. The difficulties of implementing the plan have been removed through hard negotiations. As the Secretary-General reminds us in his report, virtually all the pending questions concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have now been resolved [*S/17242, para. 45*]. All that remains to be settled is the problem of the electoral system to be used in the elections to the constituent assembly.

34. In its resolution 539 (1983), the Council called upon South Africa to communicate to the Secretary-General forthwith its choice of the electoral system. My delegation can only regret that such communication has not yet been made. But, as we all know, this is not the essential point. Resolution 539 (1983) condemned South Africa for its obstruction of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to issues extraneous to the implementation of the settlement plan. In his report, the Secretary-General points out that the South African Government persists in its intransigence and reaffirms the unacceptable link between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola [*ibid.*]. Just a few days ago [*2583rd meeting*], the representative of South Africa repeated here his Government's demands on that point.

35. France, which voted for resolution 539 (1983), has a clear and consistent position on the subject. Although it is well known to everyone here, I hope that I may be permitted to recall it briefly, as follows. Namibia's accession to independence cannot be obstructed by extraneous considerations. Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which bind all Member States of the United Nations, are sufficient in themselves. They must be implemented unconditionally

and without any preconditions. From the moment the necessary conditions for the implementation of those resolutions had been met, the French Government took the logical step of suspending, in December 1983, its participation in the work of the contact group, whose mandate in effect was only to facilitate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). However, France continues to regard itself as being wholly concerned in the matter, and intends to continue its tireless efforts for Namibia's accession to internationally recognized independence.

36. The French Government therefore reacted without waiting for the announcement by the South African Government of its decision to set up an interim government in Namibia. In a statement of 19 April [*S/17123, annex*], it recalled its commitment to resolution 435 (1978) and stated that it would regard as null and void the effects of any initiative aimed at setting up an interim government in Namibia. That decision by South Africa casts doubt on its willingness to abide by agreements and will complicate even further any move to bring about the rapid application of the United Nations settlement plan.

37. The French delegation wishes to express its extreme concern over the delays to Namibia's accession to independence. The continuation of the conflict is causing suffering to the peoples of the region, and above all to the Namibian people, which continues to be stripped of its rights and to which my delegation wishes to express its sympathy. I should like to welcome to the debate Mr. Sam Nujoma, the representative of the Namibian people. We are particularly happy that the President of SWAPO was able last week to have talks with the French Prime Minister. I am also pleased to be able to say that today the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia is in Paris for talks in the course of which there will be, in particular, an evaluation of my country's contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. The prolongation of the conflict is also fraught with danger for the stability of the countries of southern Africa, and particularly the People's Republic of Angola. The signing in February 1984 of the Lusaka Agreement, designed to guarantee the region's stability and security, was welcomed. Although there was some delay in its implementation, the Agreement made possible the disengagement of South African troops which had occupied the southern part of Angola since August 1981. In the circumstances, one can only be profoundly concerned at the recent action by South African forces in the north of Angola, which once again threatens that country's sovereignty and introduces new obstacles to a peaceful settlement of the regional problems.

38. South Africa must understand that neither through the use of force nor by ignoring United Nations resolutions will it be possible to guarantee the stability of the region and the security of each State. I stress that threats, destabilizing actions and the use of force will do nothing to advance a settlement of the Namibian question or of the problems of southern Africa as a whole.

39. My delegation appeals once again to South Africa to honour its obligations and, without any ambition for domination, to set its feet firmly on the path of dialogue with its partners in the region. It is by making such gestures, which are today more necessary than ever, that it will make possible the creation of the conditions required for the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia.

40. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Mozambique. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

41. Mr. MURARGY (Mozambique): Mr. President, allow me to begin by expressing my delegation's deep gratitude to you and to the other members of the Council for allowing me to participate in these meetings devoted to the question of Namibia. I also wish, Sir, to add my voice to previous speakers in congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June.

42. In the same vein, I wish to pay tribute to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the wisdom and skill with which he presided over the deliberations of the Council during the month May.

43. My delegation is also pleased to see at the Council table Mr. Sam Nujoma, the undisputed leader of the Namibian people.

44. The Council is meeting in response to a call made by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries and by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), through its Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa. Indeed, this meeting also responds to the call of the whole international community, which has been awaiting with impatience the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

45. In the two years since the Council last met on this question, many events have taken place which have further blocked the way towards solution of the question of Namibia. All those happenings have lent greater importance and urgency to the current meetings.

46. I am addressing the Council two days after the Central Committee of the Frelimo [*Frente de Libertaçao Moçambique*] party held its first session in 1985. Meeting just before the commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the People's Republic of Mozambique, the Central Committee devoted its attention to the assessment of the successes as well as the difficulties experienced in the course of the decade. As everyone present knows, this session of the Central Committee is convened at a particularly delicate moment in our region, characterized by the intensified acts of aggression and destabilization against our country and other countries. Attempts to undermine our independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity are being made by the imperialist forces through armed bandits, the new form of mercenarism in our region. The origin and the activities of these armed bandits, their masters, supporters and their activities are well known to the Council. This information is available in the United Nations records, particularly those of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

47. There is much that could be said about the devastating consequences of the acts of the armed bandits in my country. However, I did not come here for that purpose. When I left home, I brought along a specific and well-defined mandate: to reaffirm my Government's strong and continued support for the legitimate demands of the people of Namibia—that is, to see to the full and immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

48. I came with a determination to join my voice with the voices of those who vigorously demand that justice and freedom be restored in Namibia. I bring the solidarity of the people of Mozambique to the people of Namibia in their heroic struggle for full exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

49. After so many delegations have spoken so eloquently or gone into details on the motives behind the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978) or set forth the reasons why the people of Namibia continue to be under subjugation and exploitation and are deprived of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, one would think there was nothing else to be said. That is not the case.

50. While the brotherly people of Namibia are still under the colonial yoke there will always be a need for a voice of support and comfort in their heroic struggle.

51. The question of Namibia is one of the longest decolonization issues ever before the United Nations. What made this question so difficult to solve? That is the key question. We have answered the question in our statements before the Council in the past. However, it is our belief that the truth has to be told as many times as lies are brought out to falsify realities.

52. South Africa's involvement with Namibia dates back to 1920, when, under the mandate system of the League of Nations, it was appointed to administer what until then had been part of Germany's African empire. The mandate system was modified into that of trusteeship by the United Nations. When that occurred, South Africa categorically refused to enter into a trusteeship agreement, using the argument that its mandate had expired with the collapse of the League of Nations, and claimed unrestricted sovereignty over the Territory of Namibia. I would just remind the members of the Council that the country I represent and the People's Republic of Angola were then still so-called provinces of Portugal. Indeed the whole southern African region was under the colonial yoke. Colonial and racist harmony was the dominant factor. The only reason advanced by South Africa at the time for not leaving Namibia was that it wanted unrestricted sovereignty over the Territory.

53. In 1966 South Africa's mandate over Namibia was terminated by the General Assembly. Three years later that decision was endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 269 (1969). A deadline was set for South Africa to abandon the Territory of Namibia. Moreover, a strong message was sent to South Africa by the Council, stating that in the event of failure by South Africa to comply with the provisions of that resolution the Security Council would meet immediately to determine the necessary steps or measures to be taken in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

54. South Africa simply ignored the provisions of the above-mentioned resolution. Indeed the Security Council met many times after South Africa had refused to comply with that resolution. However, the adoption of the measures envisaged in that resolution has been postponed from session to session.

55. As time went by, important changes, both at the international level and in the region, occurred in the 1970s. It is worth while mentioning the collapse of the Portuguese empire in southern Africa. The participation of these newly independent States, as well as other independent States of the region, in the efforts that led to the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), was decisive. The adoption of that resolution constituted a switch to the right direction. For the first time in its long history, the question of Namibia enjoyed consensus among the international community, including South Africa. Following the adoption of that resolution, SWAPO, the front-line States and the Non-Aligned Movement mobilized all their efforts with a view to implementing it. Regrettably, during that period the South African régime has moved from ignoring the resolutions of the General Assembly and those of the Security Council to acting against them. It has intensified its aggression against neighbouring States; it has attacked and occupied parts of the territory of Angola.

56. The so-called linkage has come to be the name of the new dilatory manoeuvres adopted by South Africa to block the process leading to the independence of Namibia. Since this is not the first time we are referring to this issue, I shall just quote what the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique said when he addressed the Council on the question of Namibia in May 1983:

> "When we adopted resolution 435 (1978) Cuban troops were already in Angola. At that time, none of the permanent members or any Member of the United Nations established any linkage between these two realities, because we were all aware of the reason for the presence of such forces in Angola
>
> . . .
>
> "One might compare the talk about the withdrawal of the Cuban troops from Angola with a demand for the return of American troops to Washington at the time when Hitler was decimating the European populations." *[2443rd meeting, paras. 119 and 122.]*

57. My delegation wants to reiterate its strong rejection of the so-called linkage. This policy is contrary to the spirit and letter of resolution 435 (1978) and aims at depriving the people of Namibia of immediate and full exercise of their inalienable right to freedom, self-determination and independence.

58. If South Africa is really concerned with the withdrawal of the Cuban troops from Angola, why did it reject the platform proposed by the Government of Angola? Why did it send its commandos inside Angola to conduct sabotage against Angolan installations in Cabinda?

59. As far as Namibia is concerned, the only truth is that South Africa still wants unrestricted sovereignty over the Territory. All its acrobatics have been aimed at the perpetuation of its domination over Namibia. South Africa cannot, of course, openly state its intentions. The second half of the twentieth century is marked by the ever growing anti-colonial movement the world over. For this reason, even the most racist, colonialist State in the world, as South Africa has come to be, would not find it comfortable to make its colonialist intentions known.

60. The recent decision by the South African Government to set up the so-called interim government has the sole purpose of securing covertly an unrestricted sovereignty over Namibia. Were these manoeuvres to be successful, the result would be the establishment in Namibia of a government conceived and produced by South Africa for South Africa. In other words, it would be a government that is not a government at all, for it would exclude the sole authentic representative of Namibia, that is, SWAPO, and it would have no control over the affairs of the Territory. In short, it would be no more than a puppet government. Consequently Namibia would be a bantustan, and South Africa would, of course, still have unrestricted rights to plunder the invaluable resources of Namibia, and so would its allies. As was the case with the previous attempt—the so-called Turnhalle Alliance—this new attempt by the régime to further block the independence of Namibia is doomed to fail and collapse.

61. There is consensus concerning the fact that the South African Government would not be in a position clearly to defy the decisions of the international community if it did not enjoy the blessing and multiform support of certain Member States which have interests not only in Namibia but in the region as a whole. These interests were clearly and eloquently made explicit in the statements of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba [*2584th meeting*] and of the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*2583rd meeting*] before this Council. We would simply add that, whatever these interests might be, they will be better served if a climate of peace and stability is established in southern Africa. The establishment of such a climate in the region demands that Namibia be independent. It also demands that the acts of aggression and destabilization against Angola and Mozambique be stopped. Peace demands, in short, that the bloody war imposed upon us be ended once and for ever. Furthermore, there can be no peace in the region unless a democratic society based on majority rule is established in South Africa, a society wherein all citizens, irrespective of colour of skin, race or religion, have equal access to power and to all spheres of life.

62. The actions that have been carried out by the South African régime are not conducive to peace. Indeed, it represses and massacres its own people. Although it claims to reject violence, it kills peaceful and defenceless demonstrators. Unless vigorous and responsible action is taken by the Council, and by the United Nations as a whole, a conflict with unforeseeable consequences is likely to break out in the region.

63. Given the gravity of the situation in southern Africa, particularly in Namibia, we demand that the Council strongly pronounce itself against South Africa's obstruction of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We demand that the Council vehemently condemn South Africa for its decision to install the so-called interim government in Namibia and that it declare it null and void. We also deem it fitting and necessary that the Council stress, once again, its categorical rejection of the linking of Namibia's independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues. We want a message of unconditional support of hope and comfort to be sent to the people of Namibia who have great expectations in regard to the outcome of the current series of meeting of the Council. We take it for granted that the Council will also reaffirm the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people against the illegal occupation of their territory and that it will call upon all States to increase their moral, diplomatic, material and military assistance to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia.

64. I would be remiss in my duties if I concluded my statement without expressing my delegation's deep gratitude and appreciation to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts in the search for an immediate solution in regard to the question of Namibia. We sincerely commend him for duly accomplishing the mandate given to him by the Council.

65. I also cannot help associating myself with those who have spoken before me in welcoming the intensified campaign of people all over the world, particularly here in the United States and in a number of Western countries, demanding that greater pressure through legislative and other measures be exerted against racist South Africa in a concerted action to bring the illegal occupation of Namibia and the system of *apartheid* to an end.

66. The question of Namibia is again before the Council. It is for this body to assume its responsibilities and ensure the immediate and scrupulous implementation of its plan as approved in resolution 435 (1978). The time has come for the Council to adopt the measures deemed fitting, including the institution of those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, to accelerate the liberation of the people of Namibia. This is the least the Council can do to avoid more violence in the region.

67. In conclusion, I want to reaffirm our moral, political, diplomatic and material support for SWAPO, the sole, authentic representative of the people of Namibia. We also wish to reiterate our condemnation of the *apartheid* system and the policy of bantustanization and reaffirm our moral, political and diplomatic support for the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) in its struggle for an undivided South Africa, a South Africa for all South Africans.

68. *A luta continua.*

69. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Ethiopia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make a statement.

70. Mr. DINKA (Ethiopia): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express my sincere gratitude to you and the other members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to participate in the debate on the Namibian question. Allow me also to congratulate you on your assumption of the high office of the presidency for this month and to extend to you our very best and sincere wishes. We have no doubt that your experience and diplomatic skill will signficantly contribute to the successful deliberations of the Council. The delegation of Ethiopia is gratified at the fact that the issue of Namibia's independence is being debated at this critical juncture in the history of the struggle of the Namibian people under your presidency, as you represent a country whose unswerving anti-colonial stand and pan-Africanist intellectual tradition are well known to us.

71. Our appreciation also goes to the representative of Thailand for the able and serene manner in which he guided the deliberations of the Council during the month of May.

72. The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations since its inception. The United Nations, through all its major organs, has pronounced itself on different aspects of the question ever since 1946. The very first session of the General Assembly rejected South Africa's request to incorporate Namibia into its territory. From then on, the racist régime has been engaged in various manoeuvres aimed at hoodwinking the international community. It will be recalled that it first claimed sovereignty over Namibia by invoking the right of conquest. When that position became untenable it reverted to yet other legal fictions. The international community rejected all the ploys successively presented by the Pretoria régime. Indeed, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in 1966 and a year later set up a United Nations body to administer the Territory until independence. The International Court of Justice, in its landmark advisory opinion of 21 June 1971,[1] ruled the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia to be illegal.

73. The Security Council on its part has considered the question of Namibia on several occasions, and adopted numerous decisions. Resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), which approve the United Nations plan for the Territory's independence, are only some of the latest. Yet, Namibia remains under the illegal occupation of the racist-terrorist régime of South Africa.

74. That Pretoria has been able to occupy Namibia this long with impunity, in open defiance of the will of the international community and in clear violation of international law is due to the fact that it is aided and abetted in its intransigence by the Western countries, which, unfortunately and erroneously, continue to consider that citadel of institutionalized racism and State terrorism not only as a political and military ally but also as the bastion of "Western civilization". It is not surprising, therefore, that those countries should strengthen the industrial base and military capability of the *apartheid* régime while their monopolies continue to plunder the natural resources of Namibia in contravention of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[2]

75. It is the early realization of the existence of this unholy symbiosis between the *apartheid* régime and the Western countries which prompted the delegation of Ethiopia to register its serious misgivings when the Western proposal for the decolonization of Namibia was first made public. In this connection, the leader of the Ethiopian delegation at the ninth special session of the General Assembly stated:

> "The ultimate goal of the so-called Western plan is to bestow recognition on South Africa, carve out Walvis Bay and wrest more concessions from SWAPO, contrary to United Nations decisions and the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.
>
> "We reject the Western plan, not simply because of the identity of its authorship, but rather because far from bringing peace it is a scheme engineered to undermine and destroy the victories and achievements that have been gained over the long years of bitter struggle against colonial oppression and exploitation. It is clear that the Western Five are not ready to use to the full extent the influence and leverage they have in South Africa . . .".[3]

76. Similarly, despite the general mood of optimism which was engendered by the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), Ethiopia remained sceptical. We doubted both the sincerity of the terrorist-*apartheid* régime and the readiness of the Western Five to use the full range of their leverage to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) as they had promised. We sincerely regret that subsequent developments have proved us right.

77. South Africa has not only torpedoed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia but also used the intervening period to strengthen its grip over Namibia by creating further illegal institutions and organizing puppet political groups while continuing armed aggression against independent African States. It embarked upon the massive militarization of Namibia, the creation of tribal armies, the unceasing military offensive and political repression against Namibians, as well as the conscription of Namibian youth in the armed forces of the racist régime, contrary to General Assembly resolution 39/50 A of 12 December 1984. To add insult to injury, the Pretoria régime announced on 18 April 1985 its intention to install a so-called interim administration at Windhoek in total disregard of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). The net result hoped for by the racist Boers is the bantustanization of Namibia.

78. The efforts of the international community towards the peaceful decolonization of Namibia have been further frustrated by the negative attitude and behaviour of the

Western Five, which have taken the responsibility of facilitating the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). While all of them continue to use their veto power in the Council to shield the racist régime from enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, one of them, the United States, is engaged in direct attempts at preventing the implementation of the plan by introducing extraneous issues which are unrelated to the question of the decolonization of Namibia and are designed solely to subvert the sovereign prerogatives of the People's Republic of Angola, on the one hand, while espousing the so-called policy of constructive engagement, on the other. True, the world has witnessed the ever-increasing array of tricks utilized by South Africa and its allies to delay the independence of Namibia. It must be noted, however, that none of these tricks can compare in its deviousness with the malicious twins—linkage and constructive engagement.

79. It is gratifying to note that the stratagem known as the policy of linkage between the decolonization of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from Angola had been rejected by the Council in its resolution 539 (1983). Indeed, the formal pronouncements of individual Governments and international organizations clearly show the existence of a strong consensus rejecting the vicious concepts of linkage or parallelism as well as the policy of constructive engagement.

80. The Secretary-General, who symbolizes the collective will of the international community, has worked with admirable consistency and perseverance to discharge his mandate. His mission has not succeeded because of Pretoria's intransigence and the encouragement the racists receive from their Western allies.

81. We pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts and personal commitment to bring about the full implementation of the decision of the Council. We salute SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and the front-line States for their flexibility and selfless dedication in support of the efforts of the international community and the Secretary-General. On the other hand, Pretoria's consistent policy of deceit, duplicity, treachery and double-talk, as well as the machinations of those States which through their action or inaction encourage the *apartheid* régime to persist in its intransigence while shielding it with their veto from any punitive measures, deserve the most severe condemnation of the international community.

82. My delegation is convinced that as long as the five Western Powers continue to exhibit a lack of political will to act the Pretoria régime will remain intransigent and there will be no forward movement in the process of implementing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. How then could the present impasse be broken to pave the way for the accession to independence by Namibia?

83. It is the considered view of the delegation of Ethiopia that the time has come for the United Nations to reassert itself in the matter since it has the primary responsibility for Namibia under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966. It must be made clear in no uncertain terms that henceforth the United Nations will be the sole forum for any negotiation regarding Namibia. It is also imperative that a time-frame be set during which the Secretary-General will convene a meeting between the parties concerned, namely, SWAPO and the colonial Power, South Africa, with a view to implementing Council resolution 435 (1978), which remains the only legal basis.

84. Furthermore, the Council should impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa under the provisions of Chapter VII. It is right and proper that those who fail to heed the law should be brought to suffer its sanctions. We hope that the Council will act promptly and decisively in this regard, not only to accelerate the process of Namibian independence, but also to redeem its own prestige and credibility. At the same time, the Council must declare the so-called interim administration in Namibia null and void and any and all institutions established under it as unlawful.

85. The proposals just enumerated are, in our view, the minimum the Council can espouse in the face of the racist régime's contemptuous defiance of the declared will of the international community. Frankly, we do not believe that one more toothless resolution would have any meaning for an odious régime whose response to 22 earlier resolutions of this Council is well known. The time has come for the Council to stand up to Pretoria with the kind of courage commensurate with the challenge.

86. As to the final victory of the forces of independence and progress over the forces of racism, colonialism and imperialism, we have no doubt. Under the banners of SWAPO—their vanguard organization and their sole legitimate representative—and under the leadership of comrade Sam Nujoma, one of the brightest stars in the African firmament, the patriots of Namibia will triumph. There is no doubt that the fate of the so-called interim administration in Namibia will be no better than that of its precursor in another part of southern Africa, the internal settlement dreamt up by Ian Smith. Nor will the so-called multi-party conference in Namibia last longer than did the now defunct Turnhalle Alliance.

87. In conclusion, I should like to take this opportunity kindly to call upon the five Western countries, particularly those with veto power, to join the rest of mankind in isolating the racist régime and in imposing mandatory sanctions against it. While we demand that they desist from holding the independence of Namibia hostage to the pecuniary interests of their multinational corporations, we also call upon them to do what their own people—and, in some cases, their own legislatures—are demanding. We hope that they will carefully evaluate their interests in southern Africa in both the short-term and the long-term perspectives. Inasmuch as Namibia's independence is intimately linked with the freedom and dignity of the rest of Africa, we urge them to evaluate their relations with Africa on the one hand and those with the racist régime on the other. We venture to hope that this time the lofty ideals of justice will guide them so that at the end of these deliberations we can say that we

have been able to break the cycle of betrayal as regards Namibia.

88. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Kenya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

89. Mr. KIILU (Kenya): I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council for allowing my country to participate in this important series of meetings devoted to the consideration of the question of Namibian independence. I wish to express to you personally, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for this month. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that a representative of an active non-aligned and fellow-Commonwealth country should be President at a time when the international community is once again addressing itself to the serious and critical question of great importance to our continent of Africa and to the world at large.

90. Our gratitude goes also to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and to the representative of Thailand for the efficient manner in which they presided over the proceedings of the Council during the month of May.

91. The presence here of an impressive number of ministers for foreign affairs and ministers from non-aligned countries who have come to speak before the Council underscores the importance that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries attaches to this issue. It must be sufficiently clear by now that the delay of Namibian independence is becoming increasingly intolerable to all members of the international community, irrespective of their political persuasion or statures.

92. The current series of meetings of the Council on the question of Namibian independence are taking place at a time when the efforts of the international community to explore and achieve a peaceful solution to that issue are at an impasse. Today we are in the seventieth year of South Africa's illegal military occupation of Namibia. It is the nineteenth year since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and assumed direct responsibility for it. Yet, despite numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly calling for the withdrawal of the illegal occupying forces of South Africa, the Namibian people continue to languish under the tyranny of foreign occupation by the racist régime of South Africa.

93. It is also important to recall that this is the centenary year of the heroic struggle of the Namibian people for their national liberation. However, notwithstanding a long history of enormous sacrifices and bitter struggle by the Namibian people for their independence, which continues to elude them, hopes for a negotiated settlement continue to dwindle—not for lack of a political framework for negotiations, but because of the deliberate and obstructive efforts of the South African régime to block the peaceful path to freedom. Therefore, the immediate task before the Council is precisely to address itself to this impasse and to formulate possible solutions to overcome the one obstacle to Namibia's independence—namely, racist South Africa's intransigence and belligerent policies, which, moreover, pose an economic and military threat to the front-line States.

94. Kenya has eloquently stated on earlier occasions—and we wish to reiterate here now—that if Namibian independence does not soon become a reality the consequences may be too frightful to contemplate. It is therefore the solemn duty of the international community in general, and of the Council in particular, to terminate South Africa's bizarre policy of violence, which contradicts the very basic foundations of peace in the region of southern Africa, and to put an end to South Africa's persistent and blatant disregard of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to independence.

95. There can be no gainsaying the fact that the Namibian question is the Council's direct responsibility. In this context my delegation wishes to recognize and pay tribute to the efforts exerted by the Secretary-General in the matter, and also to express its appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia and the General Assembly. My delegation is very pleased at the interest that has been shown in trying to solve the problem.

96. It must be recalled with concern that since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), the credibility of the Council has been undermined. The Council has been utterly ineffective in implementing its own recommendations, although we are constantly told that negotiations outside the framework of the United Nations are continually being held. Issues that are extraneous to the United Nations plan have been raised in these negotiations and this has only served to prolong the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. Certainly, these delays have squarely fitted in South Africa's delaying and obstructive tactics. Let me reiterate once again Kenya's unwavering position that resolution 435 (1978) still remains the only legitimate basis for the independence of Namibia, without any modification, qualification or pre-conditions. It is, therefore, gratifying that a vast majority of the Member States shares that view. Unfortunately, the racist South African régime, through obstructive tactics and cunning manouevres under various guises, such as the creation of the so-called Multi-Party Conference has managed to torpedo all attempts to draft the constitution for independent Namibia. Thus, prospects of independence through the process of negotiation have become increasingly dim and frustrations more marked. The level of tension in the region has heightened, and one can envisage greater bloodshed and difficulties in the days to come.

97. Over the last 25 years, SWAPO has borne the burden of fighting for the inalienable rights of the Namibian people for freedom and independence. The United Nations recognition of SWAPO as a national liberation movement and the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people reflects the extensive support and confidence SWAPO enjoys both in Namibia and internationally. The Republic of Kenya, its people and Government wholly identify themselves with the heroic struggle of SWAPO against oppression and for the cause of the liberation of its land. We in Kenya bitterly fought for our cherished independence. We

hold the view that no nation, notwithstanding its size and power, should interfere in the affairs of Namibia. Therefore, I wish to reiterate that South Africa violates the basic ideas and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. To this end, we wish to make it unabiguously clear that: first, South Africa is in Namibia illegally; secondly, the primary responsibility for the administration of Namibia until the date of independence rests solely with the United Nations; thirdly, in exercise of its legal responsibility over Namibia, and consistent with its Charter provisions to settle disputes by peaceful means, the United Nations adopted a plan for Namibia's independence as approved by resolution 435 (1978); fourthly, South Africa has defied that resolution, resulting in no progress being made towards its implementation.

98. In light of what I have already stated, Kenya contends that what is at stake is the authority and the status of the United Nations itself in respect of Namibia. In the many years that have elapsed, co-operation, flexibility and moderation have been urged on the part of SWAPO and the African States. In this long process, many concessions have been made, and in return we have witnessed an even more determined intransigence on the part of the racist régime. As we all are aware, racist South Africa has perpetuated its brutal and illegal occupation of Namibia in flagrant violation of international law and international public opinion. Similarly, South Africa has continued to defy all relevant United Nations resolutions, including those of the Security Council, and persists in its illegal violation of the Namibian people's inalienable right to self-determination. Moreover, by its policy of destabilization of neighbouring States and massive military buildups, which are far in excess of its legitimate defence needs, the racist régime poses a threat to international peace and security.

99. No one can deny the fact that South Africa has been visibly emboldened in its continued intransigence on the question of Namibia by the wilful and flagrant violation by some countries of the mandatory arms embargo under resolution 418 (1977). Such disregard and collaboration by these States with racist South Africa have only served to bolster that country's war-machine and put a damper on the incentive to resolve the Namibian question. It is, therefore, imperative for the Council to ensure scrupulous compliance with all its resolutions on Namibia in order to prevent any such violations. In addition, any links that may exist, particularly in the realm of supply of arms, communications, commerce and industry, nuclear technology and the perceived strategic collaboration between States or transnational corporations and the Pretoria régime should be severed in order to exert greater pressure on this evil régime and isolate it.

100. It is the strong conviction of my delegation that unless and until all of us demonstrate by deeds, and not mere words, that we are determined to defend what we stand for, then it would be futile to expect the obstinate tyrants in Pretoria to respect our resolutions. The racist régime of South Africa continues with impunity to hinder Namibia's independence by violating United Nations resolutions. In order to arrest this situation, the international community must support all efforts geared towards total liberation of Africa. This support could be demonstrated by putting pressure on those Governments, firms and institutions that continue to sustain and support South Africa.

101. Kenya views certain recent developments which impede Namibian independence with grave concern and attaches considerable urgency to the resolution of the problem. The Council, therefore, must live up to its responsibility to ensure the implementation of its decisions forthwith. Kenya will continue to extend its fullest support to the people of Namibia in their valiant struggle to free themselves from the yoke of South Africa's oppressive colonial domination. We shall continue scrupulously to observe the sanctions and boycotts against South Africa.

102. Kenya is also similarly committed to support the United Nations Council for Namibia, in its capacity as the legal Administering Authority until that Territory attains independence in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). In particular, we wish to underscore the importance for the Namibian people of the Council's activities aimed at protecting and preserving the natural resources of that Territory from plundering by the racist régime and other hungry foreign Powers. Furthermore, Kenya believes that mobilization of international support for Namibia through a worldwide campaign must be strongly maintained and greatly intensified. In this connection, Kenya endorses the approach by the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of the Comprehensive Programme of Assistance to States which are neighbours of South Africa and Namibia. The Government of Kenya through bilateral arrangements has for long been rendering and continues to give its assistance in various forms, as requested by the Secretary-General.

103. I wish to reiterate that, in our view, there are only three parties interested in the critical question before the Security Council: the struggling and gallant people of Namibia, represented by SWAPO, their sole authentic representative; the oppressive racist régime of South Africa, which continues to occupy Namibia in defiance of world public opinion; and the international community, represented by the United Nations, which has direct legal responsibility for Namibia. It is therefore not only paradoxical, but also unacceptable that although both SWAPO, as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, and the United Nations, acting as the conscience and the will of the world community, have spared no effort to achieve a peaceful settlement of the problem, the racist régime of South Africa, illegally occupying Namibia, should instead have intensified its arrogant brutality and defiance.

104. Perhaps it is pertinent to recall here, before I conclude my statement, that a few weeks ago the international community observed the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of nazism and fascism, which had inflicted untold suffering and massive loss of life upon mankind. Mankind has vowed never to allow or tolerate the rebirth of such heinous, destructive ideologies. In a few months' time the international community will commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. We are all without exception looking forward, with unfathomed joy, to that momentous occasion.

105. I believe it is right and proper amidst all this excitement and joy to pause and ask ourselves how the gallant people of Namibia will view that occasion, when the United Nations has miserably failed to deliver to them their well-deserved independence. Surely—and rightfully—the Namibian people should be among us in our commemoration of the birth of this august Organization, which for the last 19 years has borne the responsibility for the administration of Namibia until it achieves independence.

106. The international community should resolve now that Namibia will be in its midst as an independent nation long before it celebrates the forty-first anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. Meanwhile, the international community, through the Security Council, should condemn in the strongest terms the so-called interim government soon to be installed in Namibia by the Pretoria régime, which is once again arrogantly defying the Council and the international community.

107. Kenya is convinced that the irresistable forces of nationalism that dismantled the great colonial empires of the past will prevail again in Namibia. We are convinced that all possible and conceivable means to get South Africa voluntarily out of Namibia have been examined and exhausted without positive results. We have therefore come to the conclusion that the international community, through the Council, has only one option left: the imposition of sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime. We are equally convinced that in order to be effective such sanctions should be both comprehensive and mandatory. Kenya therefore calls upon the Council to assume and discharge its primary responsibility under Chapter VII of the Charter.

108. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Planning and Economic Development of Uganda, Mr. Sam Odaka. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

109. Mr. ODAKA (Uganda): Let me congratulate you most warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for the current month. This is a fitting tribute to you personally and an honour for your great country with which Uganda enjoys very cordial and friendly ties. We know that your personal contribution to the struggle for liberation, and to Namibia's cause in particular, is a matter of public record. We are therefore confident that the Council's deliberations under your guidance will be successful.

110. We also wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and to the representative of Thailand for the brilliant way in which they conducted the business of the Council last month.

111. This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. The question of Namibia remains one of the few critical issues. That is a sad commentary on what would otherwise be the commendable record of the United Nations in the decolonization process. The delay in achieving the independence of Namibia is all the more agonizing because Namibia has been and remains the responsibility solely of the United Nations. Thus, our review of the record is tinged with a sense of disappointment, even a feeling of shame, that the ordeal of Namibia should have lasted so long.

112. It is seven years now since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) and with it the United Nations plan that was to lead to Namibia's independence. The plan, which was adopted after protracted negotiations, was universally endorsed and it raised much hope among the international community at the time. Namibia was expected to attain its independence within a year of the adoption of that plan. We were assured then by its primary authors, the Western contact group, that if South Africa failed to live up to its undertakings they would initiate measures to ensure its compliance.

113. Regrettably, resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations plan remain a dead letter. Each passing day further unmasks South Africa's clear intention not to abide by its undertakings. The failure of the Council to give effect to its own resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia is a source of frustration and great concern for Africa and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It should also be a matter of concern for the contact group and the international community at large.

114. Uganda has never had any illusions about South Africa's intentions and bad faith in the negotiations concerning this problem. Accordingly, we have consistently advocated the option of punitive measures under the Charter of the United Nations against that régime. The authors of the United Nations plan are in a position to ensure that South Africa complies with the plan rather than opt for blocking moves of the majority of the members of the Council to impose those sanctions. South Africa's failure to abide by injunctions of the Council has not jolted them into taking serious measures to bring it to book. Their attitude gives the impression that they are comfortable with the continued illegal occupation of Namibia.

115. Whenever our delegations have called for effective measures by the Council against South Africa, with a view to ensuring Namibia's independence, the response from the apologists for the Pretoria régime has been that we should be patient. We have always been advised that a settlement is just around the corner, and that therefore we should give more time in order that South Africa's friends may persuade the régime to comply with the United Nations plan.

116. It may be recalled that in January 1981 the Pretoria régime affronted the international community when, on the flimsiest of pretexts, it sabotaged the pre-implementation talks in Geneva. Appropriately, almost all Member States were incensed and demanded that the Council assert its authority. The almost universal call for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions was blocked by a triple veto in the Council by members of the Western contact group. They again called on all of us to be patient.

117. It is 17 years since South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated, seven years since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and two years since the Council last

deliberated on this problem, yet no settlement is in sight. It is therefore absurd and unacceptable to accuse us of not being patient enough on this matter.

118. The patience of the international community is running out. The time has come for the Council to say to South Africa that enough is enough. It is for this reason that at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April last, the Bureau called for the Security Council to meet and

> "act in a decisive manner in fulfilment of the direct responsibility of the United Nations with regard to Namibia and to take urgent measures in order to ensure that the United Nations plan as endorsed in resolution 435 (1978) is immediately and effectively implemented without modification or pre-conditions" [*S/17184 and Corr.1 para. 26*].

119. I need not labour the details of South Africa's brutal acts in the Territory. On Monday [*2583rd meeting*] the President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma, whom I am very happy to see and who has been in the struggle ever since we met in Dar es Salaam in 1963, gave the Council a graphic picture of the prevailing situation. That picture shows that the situation is very grave and continues to deteriorate. It is a picture of the militarization of Namibia, repeated acts of aggression, intervention and subversion of the front-line States and systematic attempts to destroy and discredit SWAPO.

120. There is evidence that South Africa is deliberately and systematically obstructing the implementation of the United Nations plan. The assembling of yet another group of puppets under the umbrella of the so-called Multi-Party Conference, with the declared intention of giving them fake power in an imposed internal settlement, is a clear illustration of South Africa's intentions—to abandon the United Nations plan. We welcome the rejection and condemnation by the Council and the international community of this move. The Security Council should now move to ensure that South Africa's intentions are thwarted.

121. The question which a number of delegations have rightly asked, and which I should like to repeat, is whether South Africa's military strength alone accounts for its defiant and intransigent attitude. The answer is that that is not the case. South Africa has been able to act with impunity because of the collaboration of certain Western countries. It has been defiant because of the protective shield wilfully given to it against any effective punitive measures being adopted by the Council.

122. Five years ago the United States Administration embarked on the policy of constructive engagement. The explanation then for South Africa's being lavished with carrots rather than being subjected to a stick was that the independence of Namibia would be effected and South Africa would introduce reforms there. The results of constructive engagement are before all of us to see. South Africa viewed those measures as a certificate of respectability and acceptance. Within South Africa itself the régime embarked on yet more repressive measures. As if to reveal its true colours, it marked the twentieth anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre by another massive slaughter of its indigenous citizens. It felt courageous enough flagrantly to frustrate the United Nations plan and to launch more aggressive actions against the front-line States. Constructive engagement has had the effect of undermining international efforts aimed at achieving Namibia's independence. Clearly, constructive engagement has hardly any achievement to its credit.

123. Much progress in the direction of detailed procedures for implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been achieved by 1983. The only outstanding issue was the choice of an electoral system, regarding which South Africa was to communicate its preference. The Secretary-General was able to report then: "In fact we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)" [*S/15943, para. 24*]. South Africa has up to now not declared its preference. It has deliberately sought to evade the issue.

124. Instead, extraneous issues, totally irrelevant to the question of the independence of Namibia, have been injected into the negotiations. I refer to the so-called linkage. I wish to reiterate Uganda's condemnation and rejection of this linkage. To approve of the linkage would be to sanction a basic denial of the sovereign right of the Government of Angola. It would also deny the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence. One would have expected everyone, and in particular the Western contact group, to pressure South Africa to abandon this unreasonable position. It is to us a matter for regret that inordinate pressures are instead being exerted on Angola under various guises to implement parallelism and linkage. It is unacceptable and immoral for a people's freedom to be traded and sacrificed at the altar of East-West rivalry.

125. We find it astonishing that those who express concern about the presence of Cuban troops in Angola fail to condemn South Africa's aggression against Angola and the occupation of its territory. It is worth recalling that the Cuban troops arrived in Angola well before resolution 435 (1978) was adopted. The fact that the resolution makes no reference, directly or indirectly, to their presence is evidence that the Council and indeed the authors of the United Nations plan were clear in their minds right from the outset that there was no linkage. Indeed, the Council in resolution 539 (1983) rejected linkage.

126. South Africa therefore seized the issue of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola as a pretext to delay implementation of the United Nations plan. As we all know, Angola has never posed any threat to South Africa. On the contrary, it is South Africa that has proved a constant threat to Angola and other front-line States. South Africa continues to occupy parts of southern Angola. Its commandos continue to unleash a campaign of terror on the front-line States. The latest example of this campaign, which would have involved destroying the oil installations in northern Angola, was mercifully aborted. We know of the military base in the Caprivi Strip being used as a staging-

ground for military action against the front-line States. Clearly, South Africa intends to keep its hold on Namibia and use it as a springboard for acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. We also categorically reject the notion of a regional policeman.

127. Yet another dangerous form of linkage is being introduced in the scenario for Namibia's independence by South Africa, with the full complicity of its allies. On Monday [*2583rd meeting*] the racist representative had no shame in echoing his Prime Minister, saying that Namibia's independence would be linked with developments in neighbouring countries. He even had the audacity to question whether some of them had exercised their right to self-determination. It is very well known that South Africa has set up and armed groups in neighbouring countries for the sole purpose of destabilizing them. Very often South Africa mounts military actions under the camouflage of those groups. This must not be countenanced.

128. Namibia is a unique responsibility of the United Nations. The United Nations must therefore play a central role. We are aware of many efforts by other parties to facilitate a solution. We in Africa are grateful for those efforts. While we are grateful, they should support and not supplant the central role of the United Nations. It is imperative that the United Nations play that central role.

129. South Africa's actions constitute a breach of peace. South Africa is a threat to international peace and security and it commits acts of aggression which all fall within the purview of Article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations. The Council has a duty to see that its resolutions are complied with. If South Africa does not implement resolution 435 (1978), it should impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII.

130. I wish to express our gratitude to our Secretary-General, who has exerted great efforts in search of a solution. All Member States should give him the necessary support in implementing his mandate.

131. In conclusion, I wish to reiterate Uganda's support for and solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people in their struggle. The road may be long and rough, but, considering the history of liberation, we are confident that Namibia will soon be free and independent.

132. I am particularly confident because when I addressed the Council 21 years ago, in 1964, Angola and Mozambique were not independent. They are now with us, and I was happy to hear the representative of Mozambique address the Council this evening. A number of African countries that were not independent then are now with us, and I should like to assure the President of SWAPO and the people of Namibia that we support them in their struggle, as we have all along. We want to thank all those who have supported them and who have supported Africa in its struggle.

133. We are confident. Let us adopt a resolution that will give them hope.

134. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Gora Ebrahim, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

135. Mr. EBRAHIM: Mr. President, allow me at the outset to convey the gratitude of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), the custodian of the genuine aspirations of the oppressed and dispossessed people of Azania, to you and to the other members of the Security Council for extending to us the opportunity to speak in this important debate. May we also avail ourselves of this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June and on the commitment of your country to the cause of liberation, freedom and justice. Your country's support for the just and legitimate struggles of the Azanian and Namibian peoples is highly appreciated by our people, and we know that it stems from deep commitment and historical ties.

136. More than two decades ago the decolonization struggle on the African continent began to gain momentum with the independence of Ghana. Over the past two decades the boundary of independent Africa progressively and irreversibly expanded and in 1980 reached the very last bastion of Fascist colonialism on the African continent. Since the independence of Zimbabwe in April 1980 the focus of liberation struggle has become Namibia and Azania. Although Azania and Namibia constitute two Territories, the enemy is one, namely, the minority racist régime of *apartheid* South Africa.

137. It is almost two decades since the international community, acting through the United Nations, unanimously terminated *apartheid* South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and established the Council for Namibia to lead the Territory to genuine independence. Yet almost two decades later *apartheid* South Africa still continues to occupy Namibia illegally.

138. In 1978 the Council unanimously adopted resolution 435 (1978), which clearly spelled out a principled plan for leading the Territory to genuine independence, and yet seven years later there are no firm indications that the colonial rulers of *apartheid* South Africa either are prepared to or wish to implement the provisions of that resolution. On the contrary, the régime has announced that on 17 June it is installing a puppet administration in Namibia, in blatant violation of relevant United Nations resolutions, and in particular Council resolution 435 (1978).

139. Certain facts in this whole scenario are quite glaring. First, the South African racist régime is bent on defying or ignoring international calls and appeals to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia and its *apartheid* policies and practices in South Africa. It has, moreover, become intransigent, as well as more brutal and aggressive. Secondly, the racist régime has publicly declared, even before this forum, that it considers itself a "regional Power" in this part of Africa, the consequence of that being that the racist régime will "arrange" the affairs of the region to its specifications and those of its supporters.

140. These facts are well known. However, there is a tendency in some quarters to examine truthfully what factors have led to the régime's becoming intransigent and bellicose in the region. What or who has emboldened it publicly to declare itself the gendarme of the region? The truth is that the South African régime has received and is continuing to receive overt and tacit encouragement to adopt these belligerent and bellicose postures.

141. PAC has consistently maintained that the sole cause of all the problems in southern Africa is the policies and practices of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. This is the crux of the problem. Consequently, if there is to be a viable strategy to resolve the problem in southern Africa, this objective truth must be acknowledged. It is the peoples of Azania, Namibia and the region as a whole that need protection from the universally discredited policies pursued by the minority racist régime. It is the peoples of Azania, Namibia and the region that are the victims of brutal Fascist terror unleashed by the régime to perpetuate its inhuman system and repugnant philosophy. It is the peoples of Azania, Namibia and Angola that have their territories usurped and illegally colonized by the Fascist minority régime. Yet certain Western circles, in particular the Reagan Administration, would like the world to believe that it is the illegal, Fascist, aggressive, intransigent and colonial régime of *apartheid* South Africa that needs protection and/or guarantees.

142. We began our submission with a categorical statement that in the view of PAC the racist régime had assumed this arrogant and intransigent position, as well as resort to aggression in the region, precisely because of the overt and tacit support it received—and continues to receive—from certain Western quarters, in particular the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany. PAC would like to elaborate on this.

143. We in the liberation movement have found both hypocritical and frustrating the positions adopted by some Western and other countries when it comes to dealing effectively with the racist régime of South Africa. These countries claim that they abhor *apartheid* and therefore are opposed to it. In the same breath they oppose, even more strongly, any call for the imposition of mandatory comprehensive economic sanctions against the régime, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the only viable method of struggle to which the peoples of Azania and Namibia were compelled to resort, namely, armed struggle. These countries oppose *apartheid*, oppose imposition of sanctions against the racist régime and oppose the legitimate resort by the oppressed and dispossessed people to armed struggle to realize their inalienable right to self-determination. If one opposes all three, as many Western and other countries do, what message can such a position convey to the racist régime? It can only encourage it. No criminal can feel inhibited if he or she is told that we are against his or her criminal acts but at the same time is also told that we are opposed to meting out any punishment to him or her.

144. PAC firmly believes that the Reagan Administration's policy of constructive engagement and the refusal by some Western and other countries to impose mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against the racist minority régime has emboldened it to defy the international community. Thus the accusing finger must be pointed at those who overtly or tacitly support the régime by ensuring it that they, individually or collectively, will oppose all moves to impose sanctions against the régime.

145. Some even attempt to justify their opposition to the imposition of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions under the lame excuse that such a move would hurt the oppressed more than the oppressor. A keen observer would note that it is the racist régime and its selected stooges that are engage in panic trips through Western and other capitals to plead for the welfare of the oppressed. And yet when the oppressed and exploited African workers demand union rights and a fair wage inside *apartheid* South Africa they are answered with live bullets. A pathetic member of the racist régime recently claimed that moves in the United States House of Representatives to impose selected sanctions would hurt so-called illegal workers from neighbouring countries, thereby implying that *apartheid* South Africa is acting magnanimously in providing jobs. However, what he failed to honestly state is that the *apartheid* rulers, through their so-called new constitution regarded and paraded as a "step in the right direction" in some circles, have declared all indigenous Africans, comprising 72 per cent of the total population, as foreigners in the land of their ancestors. He also failed honestly to state that Africans are daily arrested and sentenced for being illegal immigrants in what is said to be "white" South Africa, comprising 87.3 per cent of the total land areas of occupied Azania. He also failed honestly to state that his Government regards such creations as the Transkei, the Ciskei, etc. as "neighbouring States".

146. The ever-growing demand by the international community for strong measures against the racist régime, especially the imposition of mandatory comprehensive economic sanctions against the régime, has sent a wave of panic in the ruling and exploiting circles and not within the ranks of the oppressed and exploited. However, PAC would like further to illustrate that the ambiguous positions deliberately taken by some Western countries have directly contributed to the racists assuming both an intransigent and an aggressive posture. Almost a year ago the racist Pieter Botha visited several Western European capitals and the Vatican. It was said that in some capitals the visit was private. It will be recalled that the Organization of African Unity and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries pleaded with those countries and the Holy See to cancel the visit. The plea went unheeded. In fact, some of those countries told us that Botha was invited so as to be told that the authorities in those countries were opposed to *apartheid*.

147. Our struggling people paid dearly and heavily for this supposed Western diplomatic exercise of calling an international political skunk simply to tell it that it stinks. Soon after returning from these Western capitals and the Vatican, Botha and his co-conspirators imposed a so-called new constitution which, in essence, moved the country from institutionalized *apartheid* to constitutionalized *apartheid*, and embarked on yet another massacre of our oppressed,

disenfranchised and dispossessed people. According to the statistics released by the régime itself, it killed more Azanians in the first five months of this year than it did during the whole of 1984. Thus it is abundantly clear that the visits to the Western capitals and the Holy See did not have a tempering or educating effect on Pieter Botha and his entourage but emboldened him to intensify his repression internally, become more intransigent over Namibia's independence and more aggressive against the front-line and neighbouring States.

148. Moreover, it will be recalled that this year marks the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of nazism in Europe. It should also be recalled that the leading members of the ruling National Party of *apartheid* South Africa were interned during the Second World War for pro-Nazi activities. Although 40 years after the search for Nazi criminals continues, those very countries engaged in these searches are conniving with the self-declared Fascists in *apartheid* South Africa. Nazism was eliminated in Europe not at a round-table conference or by rhetorical condemnation of the evil ideology, but on the battlefield with the sacrifices of millions of patriots.

149. Despite the overt and tacit support the régime received and continues to receive, it is in a political quagmire. Today in *apartheid* South Africa the régime has been compelled to resort to the gun to perpetuate its oppression and colonial occupation. Members of the Council will no doubt agree with us that no régime likes to resort to its last weapon, the gun, unless it has no other option.

150. PAC has consistently maintained that the struggle of the Azanian and Namibian peoples is one because the enemy is the same. Moreover PAC, since its inception, has consistently maintained that the struggle in Azania and Namibia is for self-determination and national liberation. Self-determination is the primary and basic human right. It is the starting point of all other rights and this fundamental right should under no circumstances be compromised for expediency's sake or cold-war rhetoric.

151. The Azanian and Namibian peoples are demanding what is just: the inalienable right to self-determination. This demand is neither negotiable nor can it be compromised. Moreover, whilst our people would like to realize our national liberation peacefully, we are equally aware that refusal by some key Western countries to impose comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against the racist régime demands that we apply the most viable method of struggle to realize our just demands. Liberation is never given by the oppressor; it must be wrested, if need be, by waging an armed struggle.

152. We are confident that in the final analysis the peoples of Namibia and Azania, as well as the people of occupied Palestine, will triumph. About this, we have no doubt. What is in doubt is what role the Western and other countries that have thus far cushioned the racist régime will be willing to play to ensure a speedy realization of our respective liberation. If those countries are sincere in their opposition to and abhorrence of *apartheid*, then they must act concretely, now, by immediately imposing comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against the racist régime. Failure on their part to take this principled external course would only delay, but not prevent, the eventual liberation of Azania and Namibia. Today, the eyes of the oppressed, dispossessed and colonized peoples of Azania and Namibia are focused on the Council and its deliberations, and those peoples are waiting to see whether this important body will truthfully carry out its responsibility or be once more inhibited by the sectarian interests of some of its Western members. The racist régime has always stood condemned before the eyes of the African people. After this debate, and particularly if the Council should fail to invoke the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, those responsible for preventing the adoption of sanctions, a measure long overdue, will also stand condemned.

153. In conclusion, we of PAC would like to leave those who are opposed to the imposition of sanctions on the lame and unfounded grounds that it would hurt the oppressed more than the oppressor with the following thought: Would they have opposed the abolition of the abominable institution of slavery on the grounds that it would lead to unemployment among the liberated slaves?

154. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Bolivia. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

155. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is a pleasure for me to see you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago, assume the presidency of the Council.

156. I should also like to express my appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the manner in which he discharged his important responsibilities last month.

157. We all thought we had seen a glimmer of hope when the Council adopted resolution 435 (1978). Yet, despite the efforts of the international community, we are gathered here once again to deal with one more refusal by the Government of South Africa to fulfil the mandate of that resolution—in order words, to give Namibia its independence by withdrawal of all South African troops and the holding of free elections under United Nations supervision.

158. Many actions have been and are being taken by South Africa in its eagerness to delay the process of independence. My Government has condemned all those actions in a timely fashion, along with the attempts made to create a link between matters unrelated to the problem and to make their solution a precondition for implementation of the resolution. We do so again, most energetically, today as we reject the attempts of the South African régime to impose what has come to be called an internal solution in Namibia.

159. In like manner, my Government rejects the so-called Multi-Party Conference on the grounds that it is a unilateral and illegal measure designed to maintain South Africa's control and illegal domination over the Territory of Namibia.

160. It is important to mention the declaration adopted by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April last [*see S/17184 and Corr.1, annex*], which condemns and rejects those unilateral actions by the Pretoria régime and asks the Security Council immediately to adopt whatever measures it deems appropriate to ensure that the Government of South Africa complies with the provisions of its resolutions, a stand that we fully support.

161. Furthermore, the Secretary-General recognizes in his report that the prevailing difficulties have been compounded and been given a new dimension by the recent decision of South Africa to establish an interim government in Namibia, and he considers it most important that the Pretoria Government carefully reconsider the implications of its decision and desist from any actions which would contravene the relevant decisions taken by the Council [*S/17242, para. 47*]. This means that the international community must support the Secretary-General in his efforts to speed up the process that will lead to the independence of a people subjugated by a colonialist régime.

162. All these delaying tactics are a way of defying the international community, and it is urgent that the Council, with the mandate entrusted to it under the Charter of the United Nations, act rapidly to reject these illegal measures and to demand the immediate and unconditional implementation of its resolutions. If not, we will be setting a seal of approval on the policies of intimidation that the régime in power is carrying out not only against the inhabitants of the Territory of Namibia, but also by bringing pressure to bear against neighbouring States.

163. In conclusion, may I reiterate, on behalf of the Government and people of Bolivia, our support for the just cause of the valiant people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, so that they may exercise their right to self-determination and independence with complete enjoyment of their territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay.

164. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

165. Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to thank you and the other representatives here who expressed kind words to me on my taking my place in this Council for the first time.

166. It is a matter of some regret for me that some of the representatives here have deliberately and falsely represented the policies of my country for propagandistic purposes. The United States yields to no one in its support of Namibian independence and that country's speedy access to freedom.

167. My country, which first expressed the concept of self-determination of peoples, has fought two great wars this century against tyranny. It has annexed no territory and has enslaved no one. My country was anti-colonial long before it was fashionable to be so.

168. Countries which crush opposition in their own country are scarcely qualified to judge the functioning of democracy. The Reagan Administration, whether people like it or not, is the Government of the United States, chosen freely by the American people in a free election.

169. I must say that it was curious for me to hear one representative attack my country in this respect. I hope that the Vietnamese delegate's sympathy for countries occupied by foreign Powers extends to the neighbouring people of Cambodia. I was particularly interested in his attempt to interpret the functioning of American democracy, since he represents a Government that has never tolerated any opposition. It might be better if he left the interpretation of the functioning of a free democracy to those who tolerate and, therefore, understand an opposition.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

[2] Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974 (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24* (A/35/24)), vol. I, annex II.

[3] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2nd meeting, paras. 86 and 87.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة . قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—April 1994—2,050